



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Washington, D.C. 20231

15

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

09/620,521 07/20/00 ABELS

T	EXAMINER 001183
---	-----------------

PM82/0827

WILLIAM H LOGSDON  
WEBB ZIESENHEIM LOGSDON ORKIN & HANDSON  
700 KOPPERS BUILDING  
436 SEVENTH AVENUE  
PITTSBURGH PA 15219-1818

ART UNIT, D	PAPER
-------------	-------


5

3661

DATE MAILED: 08/27/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

  
TAN NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/620,521

Applicant(s)

ABELS ET AL.

Examiner

DALENA TRAN

Art Unit

3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 3661

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### **Notice to Applicant(s)**

1. This application has been examined. Claims 1-20 are pending.
2. The prior art submitted on 9/11/00 has been considered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1,3,5, and 9-10, as understood by examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Avitan (6,050,770) in view of Yuki et al. (4,520,443).

As per claims 1 and 3, Avitan discloses an industrial truck, comprising: a plurality of wheels, a load lifting system, and a drive system (see column 5, lines 12-57), and a stabilizing device (see the abstract; and column 6, lines 33-68). Avitan does not mention load sensors, and load sensors are connected to the monitoring device. However, Yuki et al. mention load sensors, and load sensors are connected to the monitoring device to control or regulate at least one of the load lifting system and the drive system (see the abstract; and columns 6-8, lines 5-29). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Avitan by mention load sensors, and load sensors are connected to the monitoring device to control or regulate at least one of the load lifting system and the drive system for

Art Unit: 3661

effectively control running attitude of the truck lifting due to lifting height control or tilting angle of an upright.

As per claim 5, Avitan discloses the monitoring device includes an evaluation unit configured to determine at least one of transverse tipping forces, longitudinal tipping forces, tipping moments, and load weight (see columns 9-10, lines 28-8).

As per claim 10, Avitan discloses the industrial truck is a counterbalanced fork lift truck (see columns 2-3, lines 66-13).

As per claim 9, Yuki et al. discloses displaying at least one of a load, a load moment, a truck speed, an acceleration, a turning radius, and tipping forces (see columns 8-10, lines 30-54).

5. Claim 2, as understood by examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Avitan (6,050,770) and Yuki et al. (4,520,443) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Ishikawa (5,947,516).

As per claim 2, Avitan and Yuki et al. do not mention the monitoring device is connected with actuator units for at least one of inclination of a lifting mast, adjusting the height of a load, adjusting vehicle speed, adjusting vehicle acceleration, adjusting braking intensity, and adjusting steering angle. However, Ishikawa mention that (see columns 2-4, lines 63-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Avitan and Yuki et al. by mention the monitoring device is connected with actuator units for at least one of inclination of a lifting mast, adjusting the height of a load, adjusting vehicle speed, adjusting vehicle acceleration, adjusting braking intensity, and adjusting steering angle to

Art Unit: 3661

maintain the vehicle in a stable state in accordance with the load weight and the load height during lifting or transportation of objects.

6. Claims 4,12, and 13, as understood by examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Avitan (6,050,770), Yuki et al. (4,520,443), and Ishikawa (5,947,516) as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Takagi et al. (5,937,965).

As per claims 4,12, and 13, Avitan, Yuki et al., and Ishikawa do not clearly mention at least one wheel on each side of the front axle of the truck has a wheel bearing with an integrated wheel load sensor. However, Takagi et al. mention that (see column 3, lines 39-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Avitan and Yuki et al. by mention at least one wheel on each side of the front axle of the truck has a wheel bearing with an integrated wheel load sensor to accurately determine the weight load in the wheel for control stability of the vehicle.

7. Claims 6-8,11, and 17-19, as understood by examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Avitan (6,050,770), Yuki et al. (4,520,443), and Takagi et al. (5,937,965) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hayashi (4,828,066).

As per claims 6, and 17-19, Hayashi mention speed of rotation sensor are connected to the monitoring unit (see columns 3-4, lines 50-65).

As per claims 7 and 11, Takagi et al. mention speed of rotation sensor are located on the same axle (see columns 4-5, lines 19-35).

Art Unit: 3661

As per claim 8, Hayashi mention measure the speed of the truck (see the abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Avitan, Yuki et al., and Takagi et al. by mention measure the speed of the truck for controlling the lifting force of the truck in accordance with the speed when the truck is moving.

8. Claims 14-16, as understood by examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C.103(a) as being unpatentable over Avitan (6,050,770), and Yuki et al. (4,520,443) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Young et al. (6,062,804).

As per claims 14-16, Avitan, and Yuki et al. do not clearly mention evaluation unit to determine at least one of transverse tipping force, longitudinal tipping forces, tipping movements, and load weight. However, Young et al. mention that (see columns 3-5, lines 53-2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teach of Avitan, and Yuki et al. by mention evaluation unit to determine at least one of transverse tipping force, longitudinal tipping forces, tipping movements, and load weight to maintain vehicle stability.

Claim 20 is method claim corresponding to truck system 1-19 above. Therefore, it is rejected for the same rationales set forth as above.

Art Unit: 3661

*Conclusion*

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

. Allen (3,677,427)

. Fink (3,815,116)

. Downing et al. (4,168,934)

. Olson (4,714,399)

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Dalena Tran, whose telephone number is (703) 308-8223. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM-4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Cuchlinski, can be reached on (703) 308-3873.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 305-7687, (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park V, 2451 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Seventh Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/620521


Page 7

Art Unit: 3661

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

/dt

August 21, 2001

  
TAN NGUYEN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER